

REMARKS

Claims 2-13, 15, 16 and 18-30 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 2-4, 11-13, 15, 16 and 18 are amended and claims 19-30 are added. The amendments and added claims introduce no new matter. Claims 1 and 17 are canceled without prejudice to, or disclaimer of, the subject matter recited in these claims. Reconsideration of the application based upon the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Gelagay during the November 27, 2007 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of a summary of the substance of the personal interview is contained in the following remarks.

The Office Action, in paragraph 6, rejects claims 1, 3, 15 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0219127 to Russ et al. (hereinafter "Russ"). The Office Action, in paragraph 8, rejects claims 2 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Russ in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,093,295 to Saito. The Office Action, in paragraph 9, rejects claims 11-13 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Russ in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,677,952 to Blakley III. The Office Action, in paragraph 10, rejects claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Russ in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,805,706 to Davis. The Office Action, in paragraph 11, rejects claims 5-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Russ in view of Saito and Blakley III. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Office Action, in paragraph 6, asserts that Russ teaches a master-receiver with features that are alleged to correspond to the combinations of all of the features recited in independent claims 1 and 17. The cancellation of claims 1 and 17 renders the rejection of these claims moot.

During the November 27 personal interview, Applicants' representative argued that Russ does not teach a storage device for storing data encrypted by the encryption module, as positively recited in now-canceled claim 1. Now-canceled claim 17 recited similar features. No agreement was reached.

Without conceding the propriety of the Examiner's position, claims 19 and 20 are added to correspond to, and clarify features recited in, now-canceled claims 1 and 17, respectively. Claim 19 additionally recites, among other features, a deciding device for deciding whether the input data is encrypted, whether to store the input data and whether to encrypt data decrypted by the decryption module. Claim 20 recites similar features. Russ does not teach, nor can it reasonably be considered to have suggested, at least these features.

Saito, Blakley III and Davis also do not teach these features. As such, Saito, Blakley III and Davis are not applied in any manner by the Office Action that would overcome the above-identified shortfall in the application of Russ to the subject matter of the pending claims.

For at least the foregoing reasons, the applied references do not teach, nor can they reasonably be considered to have suggested, the combinations of all of the features positively recited in independent claims 19 and 20. Additionally, claims 2-13, 15, 16, 18 and 21-30 are also not taught, nor would they have been suggested, by the applied references for at least the respective dependence of these claims, directly or indirectly, on allowable base claims, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 2-13, 15, 16 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §§102(e) and 103(a) as being anticipated by, or unpatentable over, the applied references are respectfully requested.

Further, the applied references do not teach, nor can they reasonably be considered to have suggested, all of the features variously recited in dependent claims 21-30. As such, claims 21-30 should also be allowed.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of 2-13, 15, 16 and 18-30 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Christopher J. Wheeler
Registration No. 60,738

JAO:CJW/clf

Attachment:
Amendment Transmittal

Date: December 11, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
